

IV. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this Reply, claims 1-14 remain pending. Claims 15-16 have been added.

Drawings Objections

Figure 1 has been amended such that the connecting region 28 has been indicated as a separate region from the source region.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 5 were amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0130354 to Sekigawa et al. (Sekigawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,575 issued to Mistry et al. (Mistry).

Claim 1 recites an electrically conductive connecting region which produces an electrically conductive connection between one of the terminal regions in the substrate regions. As noted by the examiner, Sekigawa does not teach this element. However, the examiner contends that Mistry teaches an electrically conductive connecting region which produces an electrically conductive connection between

one of the terminal regions and the substrate region. However, a detailed review of Mistry teaches a connection between the drain region and the semiconductor body. (Column 3, lines 31-33). However, the semiconductor body would correspond to the substrate 12 in the present application rather than region 14. More specifically, Mistry teaches away from the connecting region 28 forming a connection between the source region 16 and region 14, in that Mistry teaches “preferably a refractory metal silicide cladding in *direct contact* with the silicon body to form the Schottky diode.” Whereas, the current application teaches a connection to region 14.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekigawa and Mistry as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,918 issued to Smith et al. (Smith).

Claims 2 and 8 depend from claim 1. Further, Smith does not teach the elements noted above as missing from Mistry. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekigawa and Mistry as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0178670 to Fried et al. (Fried).

Claim 9 depend from claim 1. Further, Fried does not teach the elements noted above as missing from Mistry. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

New Claims

New claims 15-16 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: March 24, 2008

/Robert K. Fergan/
Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000

Attachment: Replacement Sheet of Drawings (Fig. 1)